

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/397,188	09/16/1999	GORDON GRIGOR	0100.9900670	8413
23418	7590 03/31/2003			
VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ			EXAMINER	
222 N. LASA CHICAGO, II	ALLE STREET IL 60601		CHAUHAN, ULKA J	
		·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2676	C
			DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003	9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/397,188	GRIGOR ET AL.			
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit .			
	Ulka J. Chauhan	2676			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a n places the application in			
	PLY [check either a) or b)]	·			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 1 (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	·				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);			
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	·			
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the			
<ul><li>(d)  they present additional claims without canceli</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Sec		dered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•				
8. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·			
10. Other:		Ulka J. Chauhan Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2676			
		/ u.c. Offic. 2070			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed 3/3/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the cited prior art fails to teach the limitations recited in claim 1. As argued in the previous office actions, Engstrom discloses rendering a display image to a back buffer ("stored at a first memory location of a first frame buffer") [col. 15 lines 27-43] and when an application completes rendering to back buffer, it flips the front and the back buffer to display from the front buffer after ensuring that the application does not begin wrting to a buffer that the display device is reading [col. 7 lines 25-29 and col. 19 lines 57-61]. Engstrom discloses reading the scan line register to analyze the scan line position ("determining a second memory location representative of a raster location") [col. 21 lines 28-33]. Engstrom discloses that if the position of the scan line is less then the position at the time of the last flip, then it is assumed that the display address has been changed, and the page was flipped, and it is safe to update the display address for the current flip request [col. 21 lines 28-48]. This would indicate a flip of the front and back buffer to proceed so that the application can start writing to the back buffer ("enabling... storage of the image at the first memory location when the second memory location indicates the raster has accessed data at the first memory location"). However, If the current position of the scan line is below the position of the scan line at the last flip, and a refresh amount of time has not elapsed, then an error is returned and the front and back buffer are not flipped ("preventing storage... when the second memory location indicates the raster has not accessed data at the first memory location") [col. 22 lines 19-30 and Fig. 12A].

Applicant also argues that Engstrom requires at least two buffers while the claimed invention is not restricted to two buffers. In response t applicant's argument, it is noted that this feature is not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed Cir. 1993).

Applicant also requests supporting reference to be cited in view of the Official Notice. A reference will be provided to support the Official Notice in response to a filing of a proper reply to the final rejection..